arXiv:1701.02367v1 [math.AP] 9 Jan 2017

Starshape of the superlevel sets of solutions to equations involving the fractional Laplacian in starshaped rings

Sven Jarohs[*], Tadeusz Kulczycki[†], and Paolo Salani[‡]

January 11, 2017

Abstract

In the present work we study solutions of the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u &= f(x,u) \quad && \text{in } D_0\setminus\overline{D}_1\\ u &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus D_0,\\ u &= 1 && \text{in } \overline{D}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{0.1}$$

where $D_1, D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are open sets such that $\overline{D}_1 \subset D_0$, $\alpha \in (0,2)$, and f is a nonlinearity. Under different assumptions on f we prove that, if D_0 and D_1 are starshaped with respect to the same point $\bar{x} \in \overline{D}_1$, then the same occurs for every superlevel set of u.

Keywords. fractional Laplacian · starshaped superlevel sets

1 Introduction

In this work we investigate for $\alpha \in (0,2)$ the geometry of solutions u to the problem

$$\begin{aligned} -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u &= f(x,u) \quad && \text{in } D_0\setminus\overline{D}_1\\ u &= 0 && \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus D_0,\\ u &= 1 && \text{in } \overline{D}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $D_1, D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are open sets such that $\overline{D}_1 \subset D_0$ and f is a bounded Borel function on $(D_0\setminus\overline{D}_1)\times[0,1]$. Moreover, $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$ is the fractional Laplacian, which is defined for $f \in \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ by

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) = c_{N,\alpha}\lim_{\varepsilon\downarrow 0}\int\limits_{|x-y|>\varepsilon}\frac{u(x)-u(y)}{|x-y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy, \tag{1.2}$$

[*]Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Germany, jarohs@math.uni-frankfurt.de.

[†]Wroclaw University of Science and Technology, Poland, Tadeusz.Kulczycki@pwr.edu.pl,

T. Kulczycki was supported in part by the National Science Centre, Poland, grant no. 2015/17/B/ST1/01233

[‡]DiMaI, Università di Firenze, Italy, paolo.salani@unifi.it

whenever the limit exists, where $c_{N,\alpha} = 2^{\alpha-2}\pi^{-\frac{N}{2}}\alpha(2-\alpha)\frac{\Gamma(\frac{N+\alpha}{2})}{\Gamma(2-\frac{\alpha}{2})}$ is a normalization constant and by $\mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ we denote the space of all Borel functions $u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}\cup\{\infty\}$ satisfying

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x)|}{(1+|x|)^{N+\alpha}}\,dx < \infty.$$

It is well-known that $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi(x)$ is well-defined for any $\varphi \in C^2_c(\mathbb{R}^N)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

For $u \in \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ we define the distribution $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u$ by the formula

$$\langle (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u, \varphi\rangle = \langle u, (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi\rangle \quad \text{for } \varphi \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^N),$$

(cf. Definition 3.7 in [8]). We say that a function u is a *solution* of (1.1), if u is continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N$, $u = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0$, $u = 1$ in $\overline{D}_1$, and $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u = f(x,u)$ as distributions in $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, i.e.

$$\langle -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u, \varphi\rangle = \langle f(x,u), \varphi\rangle \quad \text{for } \varphi \in C^\infty_c(D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1).$$

In other words the restriction of $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u$ to $D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1}$ is a function in $L^\infty(D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1})$ and we have

$$-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) = f(x,u(x)) \quad \text{for a.e.} \quad x \in D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1}. \tag{1.3}$$

The geometric properties of solutions to equations involving fractional Laplacians have been recently intensively studied. The results concern concavity properties of the first eigenfunction [5], [4], [23], concavity properties of solutions of the Dirichlet problem for $(-\Delta)^{1/2}\varphi = 1$ [26], convexity of superlevel sets for some problems for $(-\Delta)^{1/2}$ [28], convexity properties of solutions of $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u = f(u)$ [18], and general symmetry properties (see e.g. [6, 14, 20, 22, 31]) in the spirit of Gidas, Ni and Nirenberg [17].

Here we are interested in the starshapedness of the level sets of solutions in starshaped rings. Then let us introduce some notation and definitions.

We recall that a subset A of $\mathbb{R}^N$ is said *starshaped with respect to the point* $\bar{x} \in A$ if for every $x \in A$ the segment $(1-s)\bar{x} + sx$, $s \in [0,1]$, is contained in A. If $\bar{x} = 0$ (as we can always assume up to a translation), we simply say that A is *starshaped*, meaning that for every $x \in A$ we have $sx \in A$ for $s \in [0,1]$, or equivalently

$$A \text{ is starshaped if } \ sA \subseteq A \ \text{ for every } s \in [0,1]\,. \tag{1.4}$$

An open set A of $\mathbb{R}^N$ is said *strictly starshaped* if for every $x \in \overline{A}$ the segment sx, $s \in [0,1)$, is contained in A. We say that an open set A is *uniformly starshaped* if the exterior unit normal $\nu(x)$ exists at each $x \in \partial A$ and there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\langle x, \nu(x)\rangle \geq \varepsilon$ for every $x \in \partial A$.

By $U(\ell)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ we denote the superlevel sets of a function u:

$$U(\ell) := \{u \geq \ell\} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u(x) \geq \ell\}\,.$$

In the formulation of our results we will use the following conditions on $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $f : (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$:

(D) $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ are open sets such that $0 \in D_1$, $\overline{D}_1 \subset D_0$, and $D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1}$ satisfies a uniform exterior cone condition.

(F0) f is a bounded Borel function on $(D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$.

(F1) $t^\alpha f(tx,u) \geq f(x,u)$ for every $t \geq 1$ and $(x,u) \in (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$ such that $tx \in D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$;

(F2) f is Lipschitz in the second variable i.e. there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $x \in D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, $u_1, u_2 \in [0,1]$ we have $|f(x,u_1) - f(x,u_2)| \leq C|u_1 - u_2|$.

(F3) f is increasing in the second variable i.e. $f(x,u_1) \leq f(x,u_2)$ whenever $u_1 < u_2$ for any $x \in D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, $u_1, u_2 \in [0,1]$.

(F4) f is a bounded continuous function on $(D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$ and $f(x,0) = 0$ for any $x \in D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$.

The following theorem is the main result of our paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy (D) and $f : (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$. We have:*

(i) Assume D_0 and D_1 are bounded starshaped sets and f satisfies (F0), (F1), (F2), (F3). If u is a solution of (1.1) such that $0 \leq u \leq 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, then the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

(ii) Assume D_0 and D_1 are bounded, strictly starshaped sets and f satisfies (F0), (F1), (F2). If u is a solution of (1.1) such that $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, then the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are strictly starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

(iii) Assume $D_0 = \mathbb{R}^N$, D_1 is a bounded starshaped set, and f satisfies (F0), (F1), (F2), (F3). If u is a solution of (1.1) such that $0 \leq u \leq 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, then the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

Note that condition (F1) is analogous to condition (21) from [30]. Note also that if $D_1 = B_r(0)$ for some $r > 0$ in Theorem 1.1 (iii) and f is independent of x, then it is known that u is radial symmetric and decreasing in the radial direction (see [31, Theorem 1.10 and Corollary 1.11]). In particular, the superlevel sets of u are starshaped.
Using Theorem 1.1 and N. Abatangelo's result [1, Theorem 1.5] we obtain

Theorem 1.2. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be bounded (strictly) starshaped sets satisfying (D), $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ is a $C^{1,1}$ domain and $f : (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy (F1), (F2), (F3), (F4). Then there exists a unique solution u of (1.1). It satisfies $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ and all superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are (strictly) starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.*

Remark 1.3. If $f \in C^1((D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1])$ satisfies

(F5) $f \geq 0$ in $(D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$,

(F6) $\langle x, \nabla_x f(x,u) \rangle \geq 0$ for every $(x,u) \in (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$,

then it satisfies condition (F1). Indeed, let $t \geq 1$ and $(x,u) \in (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1]$ be such that $tx \in D_0$; then

$$f(tx,u) - f(x,u) = \int_1^t \frac{d}{ds} f(sx,u)\, ds = \int_1^t \langle x, [\nabla_x f](sx,u)\rangle \; ds.$$

Hence (F5) and (F6) imply (F1).

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1 we obtain the following result for harmonic functions with respect to fractional Laplacians.

Corollary 1.4. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be bounded (strictly) starshaped sets satisfying (D) and $f \equiv 0$. Then there exists a unique solution u of (1.1). It satisfies $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ and all superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are (strictly) starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.*

When $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ is sufficiently smooth and D_0, D_1 are uniformly starshaped we can strengthen the assertion of Corollary 1.4.

Theorem 1.5. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be open bounded sets, such that $0 \in D_1$ and $\overline{D_1} \subset D_0$. Moreover, assume D_0 and D_1 are uniformly starshaped, $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ is a $C^{1,1}$ domain and $f \equiv 0$. Then all superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of solutions u of (1.1) are uniformly starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.*

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1 we obtain more general result for harmonic functions with respect to Schrödinger operators based on fractional Laplacians.

Corollary 1.6. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be bounded (strictly) starshaped sets satisfying (D) and $f(x,u) = q(x)u$, q is a bounded nonnegative Borel function on $(D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1)$ such that*

$$q(tx) \geq q(x) \quad \text{for any } t > 1 \text{ and } x \in (t^{-1}D_0) \setminus \overline{D_1}.$$

Then there exists a unique solution u of (1.1). It satisfies $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ and all superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are (strictly) starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

As another consequences of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 we obtain the following result for Allen-Cahn-type nonlinearities.

Corollary 1.7. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be bounded strictly starshaped sets satisfying (D) and $f(x,u) = \beta u - \gamma u^p$, where $\beta \geq 0$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \geq 1$. We have*

(i) Assume $\beta \geq \gamma$. If u is a solution of (1.1) such that $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$, then the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are strictly starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

(ii) Assume $\beta \geq p\gamma$ and $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ is a $C^{1,1}$ domain. Then there exists a unique solution u of (1.1). It satisfies $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$ and all superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of u are strictly starshaped for $\ell \in (0,1)$.

We note that Theorem 1.1 is in fact a special case of the following more general result in which we do not assume u to be constant on $\overline{D_1}$ and on $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0$. To be precise, let b_0, b_1 be continuous and bounded functions on $\mathbb{R}^N$ and consider the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u &= f(x,u) \quad \text{in } D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1 \\ u &= b_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0, \\ u &= b_1 \quad \text{in } \overline{D}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{1.5}$$

We say that a function u is a *solution* of (1.5), if u is continuous and bounded on $\mathbb{R}^N$, $u = b_0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0$, $u = b_1$ in $\overline{D}_1$, and $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u = f(x,u)$ as distributions in $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $D_0, D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfy (D), $f : (D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1) \times [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and b_0, b_1 be continuous and bounded functions on $\mathbb{R}^N$such that $b_1 \equiv 1$ on ∂D_1 and $b_0 \equiv 0$ on ∂D_0 and b_0 and b_1 have starshaped superlevel sets. Then the statements (i), (ii), and (iii) of Theorem 1.1 hold for solutions u of* (1.5).

By similar methods we obtain the following result for Green functions corresponding to fractional Laplacians on convex bounded domains. For basic properties of the Green functions see Preliminaries.

Theorem 1.9. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded convex set and $G_D(x,y)$ be the Green function for D corresponding to $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$, $\alpha \in (0,2)$. Then for any fixed $y \in D$ the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$ of the function $u(x) = G_D(x,y)$ are starshaped with respect to y for any $\ell \in (0,\infty)$.*

Let us recall that in the limit case $\alpha = 2$, that is in the case of the usual Laplacian, these are all well-known result, see for instance [3, 12, 15, 16, 19, 24, 25, 27, 30].

2 Preliminaries

Let us fix some notation. In the following $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in (0,2)$. For $U \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, a nonempty measurable set, we denote by $1_U : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ the characteristic function, $|U|$ the Lebesgue measure, and $U^c = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus U$ the complement of U. The notation $D \subset\subset U$ means that $\overline{D}$ is compact and contained in the interior of U. The distance between D and U is given by $\operatorname{dist}(D,U) := \inf\{|x-y| : x \in D, y \in U\}$ and if $D = \{x\}$ we simply write $\operatorname{dist}(x,U)$. Note that this notation does *not* stand for the usual Hausdorff distance. We write $\delta_U(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, \mathbb{R}^N \setminus U)$ for the distance function. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $r > 0$, $B_r(x)$ is the open ball centered at x with radius r. We also denote $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} fg$.
Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded set. By $G_D(x,y)$ we denote the Green function of D with respect to $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$. For any $x \in D$ by $\omega_D^x(dy)$ we denote the harmonic measure of D with respect to $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$. The definition and basic properties of $G_D(x,y)$ and $\omega_D^x(dy)$ may be found e.g. in [10, pages 14-15]. It is well-known (see e.g. [9, page 297]) that

$$G_D(x,y) = K_\alpha(x-y) - \int_{D^c} K_\alpha(z-y)\omega_D^x(dz), \tag{2.1}$$

for any $x,y \in D$. For $N > \alpha$ the kernel K_α denotes the Riesz kernel given by

$$K_\alpha(x) = C_{N,\alpha}|x|^{\alpha-N},$$

where $C_{N,\alpha} = \Gamma((N-\alpha)/2)/(2^\alpha \pi^{N/2}\Gamma(\alpha/2))$. For $1 = N \leq \alpha$ the kernel K_α denotes the so-called *compensated Riesz kernel*, given by (see e.g. [9, page 296])

$$K_\alpha(x) = \frac{|x|^{\alpha-1}}{2\Gamma(\alpha)\cos(\pi\alpha/2)}, \quad \text{when } 1 = N < \alpha$$

and

$$K_\alpha(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\log\frac{1}{|x|}, \quad \text{when } 1 = N = \alpha.$$

It is well-known that for any open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ and $u \in C^2(D) \cap \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ the expression $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x)$ is well-defined for $x \in D$ and we have the following (see [10, page 9]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded set and $u \in C^2(D) \cap \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$. Then*

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(tx) = t^\alpha\left[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\right](tx) \qquad \text{for all } t > 0 \text{ and } x \in t^{-1}D.$$

Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set, $u \in \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ and assume that there exists a bounded Borel function $g : D \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u = g$$

as distributions in D. Then for any $t > 1$ we define the distribution $[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](t\cdot)$ in $t^{-1}D$ by

$$[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](t\cdot) = g(t\cdot).$$

The following generalization of Lemma 2.1 holds.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set, $u \in \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ and assume that there exists a locally integrable Borel function $g : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u = g$ as distributions in D. Let $t > 1$ and put $v(x) = u(tx)$. Then*

$$t^\alpha[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](t\cdot) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}v, \tag{2.2}$$

as distributions in $t^{-1}D$.

Remark 2.3. Equivalently (2.2) may be formulated as

$$t^\alpha[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](tx) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(tx) \qquad \text{for almost all } x \in t^{-1}D.$$

Proof. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(t^{-1}D)$. We have

$$t^\alpha\langle[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](t\cdot),\varphi\rangle \;=\; t^\alpha\langle g(t\cdot),\varphi\rangle \;=\; t^\alpha\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(tx)\varphi(x)\,dx.$$

By substitution $y = tx$ this is equal to

$$t^{\alpha-N}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} g(y)\varphi\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)dx \;\;=\;\; t^{\alpha-N}\left\langle(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u, \varphi\left(\frac{\cdot}{t}\right)\right\rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= t^{\alpha-N}\left\langle u,(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi\left(\frac{\cdot}{t}\right)\right\rangle \\ &= t^{\alpha-N}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(y)(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)dy. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1 it equals

$$t^{-N}\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N} u(y)\left[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi\right]\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)dy.$$

Substituting $x=y/t$ this finally gives

$$\int\limits_{\mathbb{R}^N} v(x)(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi(x)\,dx \;=\; \langle v,(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\varphi\rangle \;=\; \langle(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}v,\varphi\rangle.$$

□

Assume $D\subset\mathbb{R}^N$ is an open set, $g,h\in\mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$, q, g are bounded Borel functions on D and let us consider the following problem

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u-qu=g\geq 0,\quad \text{on } D \qquad u=h\geq 0,\qquad \text{on } D^c. \tag{2.3}$$

We say that u is a *solution* of (2.3) if $u\in\mathscr{L}^1_\alpha\cap L^\infty(D)$, u is continuous on $\overline{D}$, $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u-qu=g$ as distributions in D and $u=h$ holds pointwise on D^c. To prove our main statements, we use the following variant of the maximum principle.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $D\subset\mathbb{R}^N$ be an open bounded set which satisfies a uniform exterior cone condition. Assume that $q\leq 0$ on D and there is an open bounded set $D_0\subset\subset\mathbb{R}^N\setminus D$ such that h is continuous and bounded on $D^c\setminus D_0$. Then a solution u of (2.3) exists and it is unique. We have $u\geq 0$ on D. If additionally the set $\{x\in D^c : h(x)>0)\}$ has positive Lebesgue measure then $u>0$ on D.*

Proof. The proof will be done in the framework presented in [8, 9]. Let (X_t,P^x) denote the standard symmetric α-stable process in $\mathbb{R}^N$ generated by $-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}$. Denote by E^x the expected value corresponding to the process X_t starting from x and let

$$\tau_D=\inf\{t\geq 0 : X_t\notin D\}.$$

be the first exit time from D. Moreover, denote $e_q(\tau_D)=\exp\left(\int_0^{\tau_D}q(X_s)\,ds\right)$, and

$$E^x(e_q(\tau_D))=E^x\left(\exp\left(\int\limits_0^{\tau_D}q(X_s)\,ds\right)\right)\quad \text{a gauge.}$$

Since $q\leq 0$ on D we get $\sup_{x\in D}E^x(e_q(\tau_D))\leq 1$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{u}(x) &= E^x(h(X(\tau_D))e_q(\tau_D))+Vg(x),\quad x\in D \\ \tilde{u}(x) &= h(x),\quad x\in D^c, \end{aligned}$$

where V is the q-Green operator corresponding to the Schrödinger operator based on the fractional Laplacian (for the formal definition of V see [8, page 58]). By the gauge theorem (see [8, page 59]), properties of h, q and standard estimates we get $\tilde{u}(x) < \infty$ for every $x \in D$. Clearly, $\tilde{u}(x) \geq 0$ for every $x \in D$. If the set $\{x \in D^c : h(x) > 0\}$ has positive Lebesgue measure then $\tilde{u}(x) \geq E^x(h(X(\tau_D)e_q(\tau_D))) > 0$ for any $x \in D$. By [9, Theorem 4.1] and [8, Proposition 3.16] $\tilde{u}$ is a solution of (2.3).
Assume that $\tilde{\tilde{u}}$ is another solution of (2.3). Put $v = \tilde{u} - \tilde{\tilde{u}}$. Clearly $v \in L^\infty(D)$ and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} v - qv &= 0, \qquad \text{on } D \\ v &= 0, \qquad \text{on } D^c. \end{aligned}$$

By [9, Remark 6.3] and arguments from the proof of [8, Lemma 5.4] $v \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$. □

Corollary 2.5. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ be an open set which satisfies a uniform exterior cone condition, $q \leq 0$ on D and h is continuous and bounded on D^c. If u is a solution of* (2.3)*, and $\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} u(x) \geq 0$, then $u \geq 0$ on D.*

Proof. Set $u_n := u + \frac{1}{n}$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that u_n is a solution of (2.3) with h, g replaced by h_n, g_n, where $g_n = g - \frac{q}{n}$, $h_n = h + \frac{1}{n}$. Since $\liminf_{|x|\to\infty} u(x) \geq 0$, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is $r_n > 0$ such that $u_n \geq 0$ on $(B_{r_n}(0) \cap D)^c$. Set $R_n = r_n + n$. Since $B_{R_n}(0) \cap D$ satisfies again a uniform exterior cone condition, Lemma 2.4 implies $u_n \geq 0$ on $B_{R_n}(0) \cap D$. Hence the claim follows for $n \to +\infty$. □

Remark 2.6. Note that the above framework is in the sense of distributions. For maximum principles in the variational sense see e.g. [21, 22].

3 Starshapedness

For the sake of completeness we give here the following trivial lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $u : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $M = \max_{\mathbb{R}^N} u = u(0)$. Then the superlevel sets $U(\ell)$, $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$, of u are all starshaped if and only if $u(tx) \leq u(x)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every $t \geq 1$.*

Proof. Assume $U(\ell) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u(x) \geq \ell\}$ is starshaped for every $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$. By (1.4) this means that $sU(\ell) \subseteq U(\ell)$ for every $s \in [0,1)$. Now set $tx = y$ and $\ell = u(y)$; then $x = sy$ where $s = t^{-1} \in (0,1]$, whence $x \in U(\ell)$, i.e. $u(x) \geq \ell = u(tx)$.
Conversely, assume $u(x) \geq u(tx)$ for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and every $t \geq 1$. Now take $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$: if $\ell \leq \inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u$ or $\ell > M$ there is nothing to prove. Then let $\inf_{\mathbb{R}^N} u < \ell \leq M$. The superlevel set $U(\ell) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : u(x) \geq \ell\}$ is starshaped if and only if $sU(\ell) \subseteq U(\ell)$ for every $s \in [0,1]$, see (1.4). If $s = 0$ it is trivial, otherwise let $x \in U(\ell)$, that is $u(x) \geq \ell$: we want to prove that $y = sx \in U(\ell)$ as well, i.e. $u(y) \geq \ell$. But $x = ty$ where $t = s^{-1} \geq 1$, then $\ell \leq u(x) = u(ty) \leq u(y)$ and the prove is complete. □

Now we can proceed to the proofs of our main results.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. For any $t > 1$ set

$$u_t(x) = u(x) - u(tx) \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N.$$

Thanks to Lemma 3.1, the starshapedness of the level sets of u is equivalent to

$$u_t \geq 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^N \text{ for } t > 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Observe that since the superlevel sets of b_0 and b_1 are starshaped, we have $u_t \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0$ and in $t^{-1}\overline{D}_1$ and

$$u_t(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } x \in D_0 \setminus (t^{-1}D_0) \text{ and } x \in \overline{D}_1 \setminus (t^{-1}\overline{D}_1). \tag{3.2}$$

Put $D_t = (t^{-1}D_0) \setminus \overline{D}_1$. It remains to investigate u_t in D_t. Note that if D_0 is bounded then for t large enough D_t are empty.

Proof of (i). By Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u_t(x) &= (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) - t^\alpha\left[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\right](tx)\\ &= t^\alpha f(tx,u(tx)) - f(x,u(x))\\ &= t^\alpha f(tx,u(tx)) - f(x,u(tx)) + f(x,u(tx)) - f(x,u(x)).\end{aligned}$$

for almost all $x \in D_t$. For $x \in D_t$ put

$$q_t(x) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{f(x,u(tx)) - f(x,u(x))}{u_t(x)}, & \text{when} \quad u_t(x) \neq 0,\\ 0, & \text{when} \quad u_t(x) = 0.\end{cases}$$

Clearly, $f(x,u(tx)) - f(x,u(x)) = q_t(x)u_t(x)$.
Thus by (F1) we have

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u_t(x) - q_t(x)\,u_t(x) = t^\alpha f(tx,u(tx)) - f(x,u(tx)) \geq 0.$$

By (F2) $|q_t(x)| \leq C$ for $x \in D_t$. By (F3) $q_t(x) \leq 0$ for $x \in D_t$. Recall that $u_t(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in D_t^c$. Lemma 2.4 implies $u_t(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in D_t$. This finishes the proof in case (i).

Proof of (ii). In this case it is enough to show that

$$u_t(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } t > 1 \text{ and } x \in D_t. \tag{3.3}$$

Put

$$t_0 = \sup\{s \in (1,\infty) : D_s \text{ is not empty}\},$$

$$A = \{s \in (1,\infty) : \text{there exists } x \in D_s \text{ such that } u_s(x) \leq 0\}$$

and

$$t = \sup A.$$

We put $t = -\infty$ if the set A is empty. By strict starshapedness of D_0, D_1, the fact that $0 < u < 1$ on $D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1}$ and continuity of u we get that $t < t_0 < \infty$ (since D_0 is bounded).

On the contrary, assume that (3.3) does not hold. Then the set A is not empty so $t>1$. Using strict starshapedness of D_0, D_1 we obtain $u_t(x)>0$ for $x\in\partial D_t$. By continuity, $u_t(x)\geq 0$ for $x\in D_t$ and there exists $x_0\in D_t$ such that $u_t(x_0)=0$.
Similarly as before, by Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u_t(x) &= (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x)-t^{\alpha}\left[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\right](tx)\\ &= t^{\alpha}f(tx,u(tx))-f(x,u(tx))+f(x,u(tx))-f(x,u(x)).\end{aligned}$$

for almost all $x\in D_t$. For $x\in D_t$ put $F(x,t)=f(x,u(tx))-f(x,u(x))$, $F_+(x,t)=\max(0,F(x,t))$, $F_-(x,t)=\max(0,-F(x,t))$ and

$$q_t(x)=\begin{cases}\dfrac{-F_-(x,t)}{u_t(x)}, & \text{when} \quad u_t(x)\neq 0,\\ 0, & \text{when} \quad u_t(x)=0.\end{cases}$$

We have $f(x,u(tx))-f(x,u(x))=F_+(x,t)+q_t(x)u_t(x)$.
Using (F1) we obtain

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u_t(x)-q_t(x)u_t(x)=t^{\alpha}f(tx,u(tx))-f(x,u(tx))+F_+(x,t)\geq 0.$$

Clearly, $q_t(x)\leq 0$ for $x\in D_t$. By (F2) $|q_t(x)|\leq C$ for $x\in D_t$. Note that $u_t(x)>0$ for $x\in D_1\setminus t^{-1}D_1$. Clearly, $D_1\setminus t^{-1}D_1$ has positive Lebesgue measure. Recall that $u_t(x)\geq 0$ for $x\in D_t^c$. Lemma 2.4 implies $u_t(x)>0$ for $x\in D_t$. This contradicts $u_t(x_0)=0$. So (3.3) holds.
Proof of (iii). The proof proceeds exactly as the one of (i), but we use Corollary 2.5 in place of Lemma 2.4. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Choosing $b_0\equiv 0$ and $b_1\equiv 1$ in Theorem 1.8 gives Theorem 1.1. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We use [1, Theorem 1.5]. We extend f by putting $f(x,u)=f(x,0)=0$ for $u<0$ and $f(x,u)=f(x,1)$ for $u>1$ ($x\in D_0\setminus\overline{D_1}$). As a subsolution we take $\underline{u}=1_{\overline{D_1}}$, as a supersolution we take $\overline{u}=1_{D_0}$. By [1, Theorem 1.5] there exists a unique weak solution u of (1.1) in the sense of [1, Definition 1.3]. This solution satisfies $0\leq u\leq 1$. Put $D=D_0\setminus\overline{D_1}$. By [1, Theorem 1.4] we have

$$u(x)=-\int_D G_D(x,y)f(y,u(y))\,dy+h(x),\quad x\in\mathbb{R}^N, \tag{3.4}$$

where h is the unique continuous solution of

$$\begin{aligned}-(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}h=0 \quad &\text{in } D\\ h=0 \quad &\text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus D_0,\\ h=1 \quad &\text{in } \overline{D}_1.\end{aligned}$$

By [9, Lemma 5.3] we get (1.3). It is well known [8, page 57] that $\int_D G_D(x,y)f(y,u(y))\,dy$ is continuous on D. Hence u is a solution of (1.1). Now we show that $0<u<1$ in D. Since $f(x,0)=0$ for all $x\in D$ by (F4), $u\geq 0$ in D we have by (F2) that $q:D\to\mathbb{R}$,

$$q(x)=\begin{cases}-\frac{f(x,u(x))}{u(x)} & \text{for } x\in D \text{ such that } u(x)\neq 0\\ 0 & \text{otherwise},\end{cases}$$

is a bounded function which satisfies due to (F3) $q \leq 0$ in D. Hence for a.e. $x \in D$ we have

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) - q(x)u(x) = -f(x,u(x)) - q(x)u(x) = 0.$$

Since $u \equiv 1$ in $\overline{D_1}$, Lemma 2.4 implies $u > 0$ in D. Moreover, for $v = 1-u$ we have for a.e. $x \in D$

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}v(x) = -(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) = f(x,u(x)) \geq 0$$

Since $v \equiv 1$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus D_0$ and $v \equiv 0$ in D_1, Lemma 2.4 implies $v > 0$ in D and thus $1 > u$ in D as claimed. The assertions on the shape of the superlevel sets of u now follow from Theorem 1.1. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. It is well known that there exists a unique solution of (1.1) (see e.g. [10, (1.49), (1.53)], [8, page 57]). The assertion follows from Theorem 1.1. □

Proof of Corollary 1.6. Under the assumptions of this corollary, by the arguments from [8], it is well-known that there exists a unique solution u of (1.1) which satisfies $0 < u < 1$ in $D_0 \setminus \overline{D}_1$. The conditions (F0), (F1), (F2) and (F3) are clearly satisfied so the assertion follows from Theorem 1.1. □

Proof of Corollary 1.7. If $\beta \geq \gamma$ then clearly f satisfies (F0), (F1), (F2). Hence (i) follows from Theorem 1.1(ii). If $\beta \geq \gamma p$ then $\partial_u f(x,u) = \beta - \gamma p u^{p-1} \geq 0$. Hence (F3) is satisfied and (ii) follows from Theorem 1.2. □

Proof of Theorem 1.9. Case 1. $N > \alpha$.
We may assume that $y = 0$. Clearly $u(x) = 0$ when $x \notin D$. For any $t > 1$ set

$$u_t(x) = u(x) - u(tx) \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad u_t(0) = 0.$$

Then, thanks to Lemma 3.1, the statement is equivalent to prove that $u_t \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for $t > 1$. Observe that $u_t \equiv 0$ in D^c and $u_t(x) \geq 0$ for $x \in D \setminus (t^{-1}D)$. Put $D_t = (t^{-1}D) \setminus \{0\}$.
Fix $t > 1$. Put

$$h_D(x) = \int_{D^c} K_\alpha(z)\omega_D^x(dz), \quad x \in D.$$

It is clear that

$$h_D(x) \leq C_{N,\alpha}(\operatorname{dist}(0,D^c))^{\alpha-N}, \quad x \in D.$$

By (2.1) for any $x \in D_t$ we have

$$u(x) = \frac{C_{N,\alpha}}{|x|^{N-\alpha}} - h_D(x)$$

and

$$u_t(x) = \frac{C_{N,\alpha}}{|x|^{N-\alpha}}\left(1 - \frac{1}{t^{N-\alpha}}\right) - h_D(x) + h_D(tx).$$

It is obvious that there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(N,\alpha,\operatorname{dist}(0,D^c),t) > 0$ such that $\overline{B_\varepsilon(0)} \subset D_t$ and

$$u_t(x) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in B_\varepsilon(0) \setminus \{0\}.$$

By Lemma 2.1 we get

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u_t(x) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) - t^{\alpha}\left[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\right](tx) = 0,$$

for $x \in D_t \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon(0)}$. Since u_t is bounded on $D_t \setminus \overline{B_\varepsilon(0)}$, we can apply Lemma 2.4 to get $u_t \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Case 2. $1 = N \leq \alpha$.

The only bounded convex sets in $\mathbb{R}$ are bounded intervals. By scaling we may assume that $D = (-1,1)$. It is well known (see [7]) that

$$G_D(x,y) = \mathscr{B}_\alpha |x-y|^{\alpha-1} \int_0^{w(x,y)} \frac{r^{\alpha/2-1}}{(r+1)^{1/2}}\, dr, \qquad x,y \in D,\ x \neq y, \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$w(x,y) = (1-x^2)(1-y^2)/(x-y)^2,$$

and $\mathscr{B}_\alpha = 1/(2^\alpha \Gamma^2(\alpha/2))$. If $1 = N = \alpha$ we have $G_D(x,x) = \infty$, $x \in D$. If $1 = N < \alpha$ then $G_D(x,y)$ is bounded and continuous on $D \times D$ and for $x \in D$ we have $G_D(x,x) = (1-x^2)^{\alpha-1}/(2^{\alpha-1}\Gamma^2(\alpha/2)(\alpha-1))$ [9, page 298].

For $1 = N = \alpha$ the assertion follows by direct computation. Indeed, for $x,y \in D$, $x \neq y$ we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_D(x,y) = \mathscr{B}_\alpha \frac{(2xy-2)(1-y^2)}{(x-y)^3} \frac{w(x,y)^{\alpha/2-1}}{(w(x,y)+1)^{1/2}}.$$

So the function $x \to G_D(x,y)$ is increasing on $(-1,y)$ and decreasing on (y,1).

Assume now $1 = N < \alpha$. Substituting $t = r(x-y)^2$ in (3.5) we obtain

$$G_D(x,y) = \mathscr{B}_\alpha \int_0^{(1-x^2)(1-y^2)} \frac{t^{\alpha/2-1}}{(t+(x-y)^2)^{1/2}}\, dt, \qquad x,y \in D,\ x \neq y.$$

Hence for $x,y \in D$, $x \neq y$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_D(x,y) &= \mathscr{B}_\alpha \frac{-2x(1-y^2)((1-x^2)(1-y^2))^{\alpha/2-1}}{((1-x^2)(1-y^2)+(x-y)^2)^{1/2}} \\ &\quad + \mathscr{B}_\alpha (y-x) \int_0^{(1-x^2)(1-y^2)} \frac{t^{\alpha/2-1}}{(t+(x-y)^2)^{3/2}}\, dt. \end{aligned}$$

So for $x \in D \setminus \{y\}$ such that $|y-x|$ is sufficiently small $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} G_D(x,y)$ behaves like $(y-x)|y-x|^{\alpha-3}$. In particular, for $x \in D \setminus \{y\}$ such that $|y-x|$ is sufficiently small the function $x \to G_D(x,y)$ is increasing for $x < y$ and decreasing for $x > y$. The rest of the proof is similar to the proof in case $N > \alpha$ and it is omitted. □

4 Uniform starshapedness

Lemma 4.1. *Let $D \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ open and $u \in C^3(D) \cap \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha \cap W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $x \mapsto \langle x, \nabla u(x)\rangle \in C^2(D)$ and*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|\langle x, \nabla u(x)\rangle|}{(1+|x|)^{N+\alpha}}\, dx < \infty.$$

Then

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\langle x, \nabla u\rangle = \alpha(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u + \langle x, \nabla(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u\rangle \quad \text{on } D.$$

Proof. Note that if $\nabla u(x)$ exists then $\partial_t u(tx)|_{t=1} = \langle x, \nabla u(x)\rangle$. By Lemma 2.1 we have for $x \in D$

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x) + \langle x, \nabla(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(x)\rangle &= \partial_t\big(t^\alpha[(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u](tx)\big)|_{t=1}\\ &= \partial_t\big((-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}u(tx)\big)|_{t=1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, it is enough to show that the function $v(t,x) = u(tx)$, $t > 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ satisfies

$$\partial_t(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}v(t,x) = (-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}\partial_t v(t,x) \quad \text{for } t > 0,\ x \in t^{-1}D. \tag{4.1}$$

The argument will be similar to [2, Proposition B.2]. By the regularity of u, we have $v(t,\cdot) \in C^3(t^{-1}D) \cap \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha \cap W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\partial_t v(t,\cdot) \in C^2(t^{-1}D) \cap \mathscr{L}^1_\alpha$ for every $t > 0$, and thus for $t > 0$, $x \in t^{-1}D$

$$(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}v(t,x) = \frac{c_{N,\alpha}}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{2v(t,x) - v(t,x+y) - v(t,x-y)}{|y|^{N+\alpha}}\, dy.$$

Define $a, a_h : \{(t,x) \,:\, t > 0,\ x \in t^{-1}D\} \times \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$a(t,x,y) = \frac{2v(t,x) - v(t,x+y) - v(t,x-y)}{|y|^{N+\alpha}}, \quad a_h(t,x,y) = \frac{a(t+h,x,y) - a(t,x,y)}{h}, \quad h \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}$$

and fix $t > 0$, $x \in t^{-1}D$. Since D is open, we may fix $U = B_H(0)$, $H > 0$, $H < t/2$ such that $(t+h)(x+y) \in D$ for all $y \in U$ and $h \in (-H, H)$. We will show separately

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\int_U a_h(t,x,y)\, dy = \int_U \partial_t a(t,x,y)\, dy \quad \text{and} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\lim_{h\to 0}\int_{U^c} a_h(t,x,y)\, dy = \int_{U^c} \partial_t a(t,x,y)\, dy. \tag{4.3}$$

By the Mean Value Theorem, for every $0 < |h| < H$ and $y \in B_H(0)$ there is $\xi \in (-|h|, |h|)$ such that $a_h(t,x,y) = \partial_t a(t+\xi, x, y)$. Hence

$$|a_h(t,x,y)| \le c(t)\|u\|_{C^3(U)}|y|^{2-\alpha-N} \in L^1(U) \quad \text{for all } 0 < |h| < H,$$

where we used the C^2 estimate of $\partial_t v(t,\cdot)$ as given in [2, Lemma B.1]. Hence (4.2) holds by the Dominated Convergence Theorem. To see (4.3), denote $A := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^N \,:\, |x-y| \ge \varepsilon\}$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and note that there is $K > 0$, depending on u, ε, N, α, x, and U, so that

$$\left|\frac{\partial_t v(t,y)}{|x-y|^{N+\alpha}} 1_A(y)\right| = \frac{|\partial_t v(t,y)|}{1+|y|^{N+\alpha}}\frac{1+|y|^{N+\alpha}}{|x-y|^{N+\alpha}}1_A(y) \le K\frac{|\partial_t v(t,y)|}{1+|y|^{N+\alpha}}1_A(y) =: f(y).$$

Indeed, the existence of K is clear for $|x-y| \geq \frac{|y|}{2}$ and if $|x-y| < \frac{|y|}{2}$, then $\frac{|y|}{2} \leq |x|$ and hence K can be chosen depending on x. Hence, since $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, we have by the Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \int_{U^c} \frac{v(t+h,x\pm y)-v(t,x\pm y)}{h|y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy = \int_{U^c} \lim_{h\to 0} \frac{v(t+h,x\pm y)-v(t,x\pm y)}{h} \frac{1}{|y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy$$
$$= \int_{U^c} \frac{\partial_t v(t,x\pm y)}{|y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy$$

using the fact that $u \in W^{1,1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover, trivially

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \int_{U^c} \frac{v(t+h,x)-v(t,x)}{h|y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy = \int_{U^c} \frac{\partial_t v(t,x)}{|y|^{N+\alpha}}\,dy$$

and thus (4.3) holds. Finally, (4.2), (4.3) immediately imply (4.1) and this finishes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.5. Put $D = D_0 \setminus \overline{D_1}$ and $w(x) = \langle x, \nabla u(x)\rangle$. Recall that $\delta_D(x) = \operatorname{dist}(x, D^c)$. By $\nu(x)$ we denote the exterior unit normal for D_0 at $x \in \partial D_0$ and the exterior unit normal for D_1 at $x \in \partial D_1$. By the uniform starshapedness assumption, for any $x \in \partial D$ we have $\langle x, \nu(x)\rangle \geq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Note that it remains to show that $|\nabla u(x)| > 0$ and there exists $c > 0$ such that

$$\frac{w(x)}{|\nabla u(x)|} \leq -c \quad \text{for any } x \in D. \tag{4.4}$$

By well known properties of $C^{1,1}$ domains there exists $r_1 > 0$ such that for all $x \in D$ with $\delta_D(x) \leq r_1$ there exists a unique point $x^* \in \partial D$ such that $|x - x^*| = \delta_D(x)$. For any $x \in D$ such that $\delta_D(x) \leq r_1$ put $\nu(x) = \nu(x^*)$. There exists $r_2 \in (0, r_1]$ such that for all $x \in D$ with $\delta_D(x) \leq r_2$ we have $\langle x, \nu(x)\rangle \geq \varepsilon/2$. By [11, Lemma 4.5] and standard arguments as in [26, proof of Lemma 3.2] there exists $r_3 \in (0, r_2]$ and $c > 0$ such that for all $x \in D$ with $\delta_D(x) \leq r_3$ we have $\langle \nu(x), \nabla u(x)\rangle \leq -c\delta_D^{\alpha/2-1}(x)$, and $|\langle t(x), \nabla u(x)\rangle| \leq c \max(\delta_D^{1-\alpha/2}(x), \delta_D^{\alpha/2}(x))|\log(\delta_D(x))|$, for any vector $t(x)$ perpendicular to $\nu(x)$. Hence there there exists $r_4 \in (0, r_3]$ such that for all $x \in D' := \{x \in D : \delta_D(x) \leq r_4\}$ we have $|\nabla u(x)| > 0$ and

$$\frac{w(x)}{|\nabla u(x)|} \leq -\varepsilon/4. \tag{4.5}$$

Now we will use Lemma 4.1 for u. By similar arguments as in the proof of [29, Proposition 1.1] we get $u \in C^{\alpha/2}(\mathbb{R}^N)$. Other assumptions on u in Lemma 4.1 are clearly satisfied. By this lemma we obtain $(-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} w(x) = 0$ in $D \setminus D'$. We also have $w \leq 0$ on $\operatorname{int}(D^c \cup D')$ and $|\{w < 0\} \cap D'| > 0$ by (4.5). Since D_0 is bounded, Lemma 2.4 implies $w < 0$ in $D \setminus D'$. Hence with (4.5) and the continuity of w in $\overline{D \setminus D'}$ there exists some $c_1 > 0$ such that $w(x) \leq -c_1$ in D implying (4.4). □

References

[1] N. Abatangelo, *Large s-harmonic functions and boundary blow-up solutions for the fractional Laplacian*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 35, no. 12 (2015), 5555–5607.

[2] N. Abatangelo, S. Jarohs, A. Saldaña, *On the maximum principle for higher-order fractional Laplacians*, preprint (2016) https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.00929.

[3] A. Acker *On the uniqueness, monotonicity, starlikeness and convexity of solutions for a nonlinear boundary value problem in elliptic PDEs*, Nonlinear Anal. Theory Methods Appl. 22, No.6 (1994), 697–705.

[4] R. Bañuelos, R. D. DeBlassie, *On the First Eigenfunction of the Symmetric Stable Process in a Bounded Lipschitz Domain*, Potential Anal. 42, no. 2 (2015), 573–583.

[5] R. Bañuelos, T. Kulczycki, P. J. Méndez-Hernández, *On the shape of the ground state eigenfunction for stable processes*, Potential Anal. 24 (2006), 205-221.

[6] M. Birkner, J. A. López-Mimbela, A. Wakolbinger, *Comparison results and steady states for the Fujita equation with fractional Laplacian*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 22 (2005), 83–97.

[7] R. M. Blumenthal, R. K. Getoor, D. B. Ray, *On the distributions of first hits for the symmetric stable processes*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 99 (1961), 540-554.

[8] K. Bogdan, T. Byczkowski *Potential theory for the α-stable Schrödinger operator on bounded Lipschitz domains*, Studia Math., 133(1) (1999), 53–92.

[9] K. Bogdan, T. Byczkowski *Potential theory of Schrdinger operator based on fractional Laplacian* Probab. Math. Statist. 20 (2000), 293–335.

[10] K. Bogdan, T. Byczkowski, T. Kulczycki, M. Ryznar, R. Song, Z. Vondraček, *Potential analysis of stable processes and its extensions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1980, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, (2009).

[11] K. Bogdan, T. Kulczycki, A. Nowak *Gradient estimates for harmonic and q-harmonic functions of symmetric stable processes*, Illinois J. Math. 46 (2002), no. 2, 541–556.

[12] J.I. Diaz, B. Kawohl, *On convexity and starshapedness of level sets for some nonlinear elliptic and parabolic problems on convex rings*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 177, No.1 (1993), 263–286.

[13] M. M. Fall, S. Jarohs, *Overdetermined problems with fractional Laplacian*, ESAIM: COCV 21(4) (2015), 924–938.

[14] P. Felmer, A. Quaas, J. Tan, *Positive solutions of nonlinear Schrödinger equation with the fractional Laplacian*, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 142, no. 2 (2012), 1237–1262

[15] E. Francini, *Starshapedness of level sets for solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations*, Math. Nach. 193 (1998), 49–56.

[16] E. Francini, A. Greco, *Blow-up in exterior domains: existence and starshapedness*, Z. Anal. Anwend. 17 n.2 (1998), 431–441.

[17] B. Gidas, W. N. Ni and L. Nirenberg, *Symmetry and related properties via the maximum principle*, Comm. Math. Phys. 68, no. 3 (1979), 209-243.

[18] A. Greco, *Fractional convexity maximum principle*, preprint (2015), https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/c30c/51de602ad36ee457318603bc49a472df5a53.pdf

[19] A. Greco, W. Reichel, *Existence and starshapedness for the Lane-Emden equation*, Appl. Anal. 78 (2001) n.1-2, 21–23.

[20] S. Jarohs, T. Weth, *Asymptotic symmetry for a class of nonlinear fractional reaction-diffusion equations*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 34, no. 6 (2014), 2581–2615.

[21] S. Jarohs, T. Weth, *Symmetry via antisymmetric maximum principles in nonlocal problems of variable order*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) 195, no. 1 (2016), 273–291.

[22] S. Jarohs, *Symmetry of solutions to nonlocal nonlinear boundary value problems in radial sets*, NoDEA Nonlinear Differential Equations Appl. 23, no. 3 (2016), 1–22.

[23] M. Kaßmann, L. Silvestre, *On the superharmonicity of the first eigenfunction of the fractional Laplacian for certain exponents*, preprint (2014), http://math.uchicago.edu/∼luis/preprints/cfe.pdf

[24] B. Kawohl, *Rearrangements and convexity of level sets in P.D.E.*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 1150, Springer, Berlin, 1985.

[25] B. Kawohl, *Geometrical properties of level sets of solutions to elliptic ring problems*, Symp. Pure Math. 45 (1986), part II, 541–556.

[26] T. Kulczycki, *On concavity of solutions of the Dirichlet problem for the equation* $(-\Delta)^{1/2}\varphi = 1$ *in convex planar regions*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (to appear), http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.3846

[27] M. Longinetti, *A maximum principle for the starshape of solutions of nonlinear Poisson equations*, Boll. UMI 6, 4-A (1985), 91–96.

[28] M. Novaga, B. Ruffini, *Brunn-Minkowski inequality for the 1-Riesz capacity and level set convexity for the 1/2-Laplacian*, J. Convex Anal. 22 (2015), no. 4, 1125-1134.

[29] X. Ros-Oton, J. Serra, *The Dirichlet problem for the fractional Laplacian: regularity up to the boundary*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 101(3) (2014), 275–302.

[30] P. Salani, *Starshapedness of level sets of solutions to elliptic PDEs*, Appl. Anal. 84 (2005), no. 12, 1185-1197.

[31] N. Soave, E. Valdinoci, *Overdetermined problems for the fractional Laplacian in exterior and annular sets*, preprint (2014) http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.5074.